

MINUTES: of the meeting of Surrey County Council's Local Committee (Reigate and Banstead) held at 14:00 on Monday 1 March 2010 at Reigate Town Hall.

THESE MINUTES REMAIN DRAFT UNTIL FORMALLY APPROVED AT THE 21 JUNE 2010 MEETING

Members Present – Surrey County Council

Mrs Dorothy Ross-Tomlin (Chairman)	Dr Lynne Hack
Mrs Frances King (Vice-Chairman)	Mrs Kay Hammond
Mrs Angela Fraser	Mr Nick Harrison
Mr Michael Gosling	Mr Peter Lambell
Dr Zully Grant-Duff	

Members Present – Reigate and Banstead Borough Council

Cllr Richard Bennett	Cllr Brian Stead
Cllr Mark Brunt	Cllr Anna Tarrant
Cllr Brian Cowle	Cllr Richard Wagner
Cllr Adam De Save	

PART ONE - IN PUBLIC

[All references to items refer to the agenda for the meeting]

05/10 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Mrs Mill and Cllr Dr Olliver. Cllr Brunt substituted for Cllr Dr Olliver.

06/10 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS – 7 DECEMBER 2009 AND 25 JANUARY 2010 [Item 2]

The minutes were agreed as an accurate record of the two previous meetings.

[Minute 66/09 –Members wished to know if a response had been received from the Executive Member and it was agreed that this would be followed up.]

07/10 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

Item 14 – Mr Peter Lambell declared a personal interest in this item by virtue of his wife being involved in Transition Town Reigate and

Redhill.

Item 15 – Cllr Mark Brunt declared a personal interest in this item by virtue of being Chairman of the Merstham Community Facility Trust.

08/10 **PETITIONS [Item 4]**

None received.

09/10 **FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]**

Three public questions on Highways matters were received. Written responses are attached as **Appendix A**.

10/10 **FORMAL MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 6]**

Two Member questions were received. Written responses are attached as **Appendix B**.

[The Interim Local Highways Manager agreed to take the Member's comments on vehicular crossovers to the officers looking into the policy, and agreed to send all Members a full list of highway repairs following the severe winter weather (those completed and those due to be completed before the end of the financial year).]

11/10 **SERVICES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE – LOCAL DELIVERY PLAN [Item 7]**

A revised report was tabled, and is attached as **Appendix C**.

The Head of the Transformation Project presented the report to Members.

During discussion with the Committee, the following key points were raised:

- Concerns were raised regarding Quarter 3 performance on the “Contact with 13-19 year old cohort” indicator, which was 8% against a target of 25%. The officer reported that this figure did not include participation in Duke of Edinburgh's Award and Surrey Outdoor Learning and Development, and agreed to provide figures for these areas.
- Members wished to know why a commissioning led service was the best way forward and what was likely to change. The officer informed the Committee that a commissioning led service would issue tender specifications for providers to deliver against outcomes; for example, the number of NEETs (Not in Education, Employment or Training) helped into work.

- Assurance was sought that the County Council did not intend to dispose of the Oakley Youth Centre in Merstham. The officer replied that the omission of the Oakley from the report was an oversight and nothing about the centre's future should be inferred from this. It was also noted that both the Youth Development Service and Youth Justice Service were very active in the Merstham community, and an audit on youth crime and anti-social behaviour had recently been carried out.
- Members asked why church youth organisations had not been mentioned in the report. The officer reported that he was happy to receive suggestions and would take this away from the meeting.
- It was suggested that increased partnership work between the County Council and the Borough Council's Leisure Services could have an impact. The officer informed the Committee that the Service was willing to work in partnership with the Borough Council, as well as the voluntary and community sector. A focus on the utilisation of assets, in particular buildings, was required. It was also important to engage young people who had been involved with the Youth Justice System in mainstream services.
- Members noted the importance of the uniformed youth groups operating in the Borough, such as the Scouts and Cadets.
- Concerns were raised that in becoming a commissioning led service, there was an attempt to pass on responsibility to the voluntary and community sector. The officer informed Members that this was not the intention.
- Members asked whether the scrutiny of commissioned services had been considered, and whether a business case for the proposals had been developed. The officer reported that scrutiny would be built into any plans put forward, and that a project approach would be applied to producing a business case. All proposals would go to the relevant Select Committee before seeking approval from Cabinet.
- Members asked if the Total Place approach would affect the plans. The officer noted that the Service was interested in this approach, and that Total Place commissioning was a possibility.

The Cabinet Member for Community Safety summed up the debate by welcoming the Committee's comments and thanking them for their level of engagement in the debate. She recognised that the Service had a difficult task, and that needs change as young people change, therefore the Service needed to be flexible and able to shift resources where necessary. She assured Members that young people were involved in the proposals, with the Transformation Board including two young representatives.

The Committee **AGREED:**

- (i) To approve the Youth Development Service component of the Services for Young People Delivery Plan 2010/11.

- (ii) To note the transformation strategy for young people.

12/10 **REPORT ON SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL TRADING STANDARDS SERVICE [Item 8]**

During discussion by the Committee, the following key points were raised:

- Members noted that the Buy With Confidence scheme now has 360 members and is almost self-financing. It was asked how the scheme was promoted, and whether leaflets are displayed in libraries, for example.
- Members wished to know if there were plans for further No Cold Calling Zones.
- Members commended officers and the report.

The Cabinet Member for Community Safety agreed to take the points raised to the service and would report back to Members.

The Committee **NOTED** the activities being undertaken by the Trading Standards Service.

13/10 **BANSTEAD AND SOUTHERN VILLAGES PARKING REVIEW [Item 9]**

A revised Annex A and drawings were tabled, and are attached as **Appendix D**.

The Parking Strategy and Implementation Group Manager presented the report.

During discussion by the Committee, the following key points were raised:

- Concerns were raised that Borough Councillors in Banstead had not been adequately consulted on the proposals, and that additions and amendments to the proposals were required.
- The proposals at Wells Place, Merstham, were welcomed by local Members and would deal with an issue which had been an ongoing concern for residents.
- Concerns were raised that the list of roads not included in the review did not provide an explanation of why they had not been included.
- Concerns were raised that Residents' Associations had not been consulted.
- It was suggested that any changes require assurance from the Borough Council that adequate enforcement capacity is available. The officer assured Members that no concerns had been raised

by Borough Council officers.

- It was felt that the lack of drawings meant that Members could not take an informed decision.

Dr Lynne Hack, seconded by Cllr Mark Brunt, proposed that decision on the item be deferred until adequate consultation with Members (County and Borough) had taken place. This was put to the vote.

The Committee agreed to **DEFER** decision on this item on this item until the next meeting of the Local Committee on 21 June 2010.

14/10 **A23 LONDON ROAD, MERSTHAM – PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS TO PARKING AND CYCLING PROVISION [Item 10]**

The Interim Local Highways Manager presented the report.

During discussion by the Committee, the following key points were raised:

- Option 1 was generally supported, although concerns were raised by Members that the cycle lane should have a differently coloured surface in order to increase its visibility to drivers. It was acknowledged that this would increase the cost and Members suggested that Section 106 funds could be used for this. The Interim Local Highways Manager agreed to discuss this with officers from the Borough Council.
- Concerns were raised regarding the sightlines at the junction with Station Road North, and it was suggested that the scheme not be implemented until yellow lines had been installed here.
- Members asked whether Option 2 would only be viable if the parapet of the motorway bridge was raised. The officer responded that this was the case, and that this would be extremely expensive.
- Members wished to know whether the scheme would be implemented before the next budget allocation was agreed. The officer reported that he was looking to implement the scheme in the next financial year. The Integrated Transport Schemes budget would be brought for approval at the next meeting of the Local Committee and it was not possible to confirm the capital allocation until then.
- It was suggested that funding for cycling schemes was available centrally. The Interim Local Highways Officer agreed to speak to the County Council's Cycling Officer about this.
- Members asked whether it would be safer and cheaper for the cycle lane to be adjacent to the pavement. The officer replied that due to the nature of cycling on the A23, cyclists were more likely to stay on the road. This option would also cost at least twice as much as the recommended option.

The Committee **AGREED** that Option 1 as shown in Annex B to the report submitted be approved for detailed design and implementation.

15/10 **C137/1644 HAZELWOOD LANE BRIDGE, CHIPSTEAD [Item 11]**

The Principal Engineer, Structures presented the report.

During discussion by the Committee, the following key points were raised:

- Members supported implementation as soon as soon as possible, but asked where signage would be placed. The officer informed the Committee that signs would be placed at the bridge site, with advance signage at locations to enable vehicles to turn round.
- Concerns were raised that the current width restriction of 6ft 6ins was not enforced. The officer replied that this is an environmental restriction and has exemptions; therefore it is difficult to enforce. The weight restriction has no exemptions.
- Members asked what the alternative route was, given that in their view, the entire area was unsuitable for HGVs. The officer informed the Committee that the alternative route is Chipstead Valley Road, and appropriate signs would be put in place.

The Committee **AGREED** that:

- (i) A permanent weight restriction of 18 tonnes be imposed on Hazelwood Lane Bridge and that the necessary traffic regulation order be advertised and if no objection be maintained the order be made.
- (ii) If objections are received that they be reported back to Committee.

16/10 **PROPOSED BUS STOP CLEARWAY – A23 LONDON ROAD, REDHILL [Item 12]**

The Interim Local Highways Manager presented the report.

During discussion by the Committee the following key points were raised:

- Members asked whether there were restrictions on parking on roads with long dashed white lines, and if so, whether these were enforced. The officer replied that there were no such restrictions.

The Committee **AGREED** that a 24 hour bus clearway be implemented as shown in Annex A to the report submitted.

17/10 **HIGHWAYS WINTER EVENT UPDATE [Item 13]**

The report was tabled and is attached as **Appendix E**.

The Interim Local Highways Manager presented the report, and thanked the Borough Council for their co-operation during the severe weather in January. He acknowledged that communication with the public could be improved upon, and agreed to send all Members details of the current Priority 1 and 2 roads for comment before a review for next year's Winter Maintenance Plan.

During discussion with the Committee, the following key points were raised:

- Members requested that village shopping parades be salted earlier, as these become even more vital to residents during extreme weather. The Interim Local Highways Manager noted this point for next year's plan.
- Concerns were raised that grit and salt was left on roads and pavements after the event and should be swept away. The officer noted the point.
- Members reported that Chipstead Village was cut off to all non-four wheel drive vehicles. This was noted as a priority for next year's plan.
- Concerns were raised that grit bins had not been refilled. The officer reported that a gang was currently refilling grit bins throughout East Surrey, and agreed to send a progress list to Members. It was suggested that a map of the location of bins be made available, and the officer agreed to look into providing one.
- Concerns were raised regarding communication with the public, particularly around the issue of repairs to the road surface following the winter event, and ensuring that the public and businesses took responsibility for removing snow and ice from outside their property (and debunking the myth that this was not permitted under health and safety regulations). It was noted that press releases had been issued, although the local press were often reluctant to publish good news stories. Officers acknowledged that communications could be improved.
- Members reported that poor drainage on Banstead High Street meant that water splashing onto the pavement had frozen overnight during the cold weather, causing a hazard to pedestrians. It was requested that the drainage issue be addressed before next winter, and officers agreed to look into this.
- Concerns were raised that Rocky Lane, Merstham, had not been gritted, causing access problems for the Royal Alexandra and

Albert School. The officer noted this.

- Members were concerned about a possible reduction in grit bins. The officer noted the provision of bins was not a statutory duty, and the review would look at the number of bins and how they were filled. The reduction or increase of bins would be considered.
- Concerns were raised that Tadworth shopping parade was not included on the list; officers agreed to look into this.

The Committee **NOTED** the report.

18/10 **CLIMATE CHANGE FUND [Item 14]**

Mr Peter Lambell declared a personal interest in this item by virtue of his wife being involved in Transition Town Reigate and Redhill.

Following discussion of the three bids in the report submitted, the Committee **AGREED** that the following bids be submitted to the judging panel:

- | | |
|---|--------|
| 1. Raven Housing Trust – three environmental projects around the Borough | £6,825 |
| 2. St Joseph’s Catholic Primary School, Redhill - installation of six raised gardening beds and large composting bed as part of School Grounds Project (£3,100) | £3,100 |

19/10 **LOCAL COMMITTEE FUNDING [Item 15]**

Cllr Mark Brunt declared a personal interest in this item by virtue of being Chairman of the Merstham Community Facility Trust.

The Committee:

- (i) **AGREED** the following items submitted for funding from 2009/10 Local Committee delegated revenue budget totalling £25,570:

- | | |
|---|--------|
| 1. St George’s Club, Hooley – Transfer to Merstham Centre | £1,560 |
| 2. Star for a Night 2010 | £3,000 |
| 3. Climbing Wall at Scout Ridge, Banstead | £1,500 |
| 4. Walking for Health in Reigate and Banstead | £1,000 |
| 5. Surrey Wildlife Trust – Drive for Volunteering Across Surrey | £2,000 |
| 6. Reigate Mini Rugby Club | £1,410 |
| 7. Playground Equipment for Children with Disabilities | £5,000 |

8.	Banstead Community Junior School Wildlife Garden	£2,000
9.	Salfords and NV Youth Club	£2,000
10.	Contact the Elderly – Salfords and Horley (Salfords - £300; Horley - £500)	£800
11.	Merstham Community Facility Trust – IT Café	£2,400
12.	Activities in Whitebushes	£2,000
13.	Warren Mead Infant School – School Library Development Project	£900

(ii) **AGREED** the following item submitted for funding from 2009/10 Local Committee capital budget:

1.	Reigate Methodist Church – Community Centre Project	£15,000
----	---	---------

20/10 **CABINET FORWARD PLAN [Item 16]**

The Committee **NOTED** the report.

21/10 **LOCAL COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN [Item 17]**

The Committee **NOTED** the report.

[Meeting Ended: 4.45pm. Adjourned between 3.30pm-3.40pm]

Chairman

Three Public Questions have been received from Mrs Anne Coward:

1. "Why is it such a struggle to obtain replies from Council Officers on highway matters such that the relevant issue almost always has to be elevated to 'formal complaint' level?"

Response of the Interim Local Highways Manager:

Surrey Highways has recorded 21 communications from Anne Coward in the last two years. The records show that four emails and 14 other communications were replied to within 10 days. The remaining three communications have unfortunately taken a longer period. It is of course disappointing when it is felt that a formal complaint is necessary, but Surrey Highways officers always endeavour to provide prompt and helpful responses.

2. "Will the Council be taking account of feedback from local residents, the Residents' Association and other interested parties on the proposed pinchpoint in Woodmansterne Street before implementing any changes?"

Response of the Interim Local Highways Manager:

Comments have been received from local residents and the Woodmansterne Green Belt and Residents' Association regarding the proposed footway improvement scheme for Woodmansterne Street. These comments have been considered, although there was no formal process necessary such as that undertaken for Traffic Regulation Orders. The comments received have been generally supportive of the principle of widening the footway, improving the footway crossfall and providing an informal crossing point. There has been discussion about pedestrians crossing between the Sports Club and the Recreation Ground, but this falls outside the scope of this scheme. However, additional road markings have been incorporated into the detailed design to slow drivers on the approach to both the Sports Club crossing point and the proposed crossing point at the new road narrowing. The improvement scheme is programmed for construction in March 2010.

3. "Surrey CC install robust road humps able to withstand the passage of vehicles so why can't it make durable repairs to potholes?"

Response of the Interim Local Highways Manager:

There are many variables that apply to the performance of the surfacing and structure of carriageways. With regard to road humps and pothole repairs, perhaps the most significant difference is the size of the works. A road hump is large enough to have its own strength and integrity and can be designed to accommodate the traffic loading. However, a pothole repair usually takes place in a road that is in quite poor condition. It has to rely on the surrounding material to adhere to the new bituminous fill and often it is the joint or existing material that begins to fail and not the actual pothole refill. Once the bond between the pothole repair and the existing road is broken, the repair is not supported and it fails. However, Surrey Highways also carries out patching works where more permanent repairs are achieved by cutting new edges and ensuring the material is effectively compacted. This is a more expensive

option and is appropriate for programmed work rather than dealing with the current high demand for quick reactive filling of potholes.

APPENDIX B

One Member Question has been received from Mr Nick Harrison (Banstead West):

“Residents in Tumblewood Road, Banstead have been dismayed that Surrey Highways have granted approval for a householder to remove almost the entire length of a grass verge and then concrete it over, creating a substantial and incongruous change in the street scene.

This approval is contrary to Paragraph 7 of the “SCC Vehicle Crossover Approval Process Guidance” which states “Vehicle crossings will generally NOT be approved, or an existing crossing widened, so it covers the full length of the property.”

In writing to residents, Surrey Highways have stated that the Council’s powers to decline an application cannot be based on appearance alone and have to be supported by a highway issue, which does not apply in this residential road.

In addition, Surrey Highways have sought to put the onus on the planning authority who have subsequently disclosed that they do not have a policy which deals with crossovers on unclassified roads.

Could an explanation be provided of the Council’s policy guidance and decision in this matter?”

Response of the Interim Local Highways Manager:

The SCC Vehicle Crossover Approval Process Guidance Paragraph 7 only states that vehicle crossings will generally not be approved, or an existing crossing widened, so it covers the full length of the property. This condition was introduced to allow SCC to refuse full width crossovers in roads where we need to retain kerbside parking provision for use of the general public. This was not seen to be the case in Tumblewood Road and so the application to widen the existing crossovers was passed. The resident in Tumblewood Road was intent on using his entire front garden for parking provision.

One Member Question has been received from Cllr Brian Stead (Nork):

“Residents are becoming increasingly angry at the parlous condition of our roads. Deep potholes are everywhere. Loose stones are a further hazard. Drivers are carrying out avoiding action risking even further danger. Holes are being filled with asphalt and stamped in with a spade only to break up a few days later. Comparison with the neighbouring Epsom is invidious where repairs are apparently being made by cutting out, and filled with molten pitch and rolled asphalt. What action is being taken in Reigate and Banstead? What supervision is there? What is being planned? When can we expect roads in a reasonable condition?”

Response of the Interim Local Highways Manager:

More resources have been deployed to repair the roads in Reigate and Banstead since the deterioration caused by the damaging effects of the winter event from late December 2009 to mid January 2010. An indication of what is being achieved with this extra resource is the 865 Category 1 defects that were repaired in the east of the

County in the first six weeks of this year, which is as many as in the first three months of 2009.

Category 1 defects should be dealt with quickly, within 24 hours if possible. Quick fill methods are used to deal with the current high demand for such urgent reactive refilling of potholes. However, planned patching and surfacing is also being carried out to provide better and more permanent repairs. There are 25 gangs at present in the east of the County undertaking a mixture of planned and reactive highway defect repairs.

The priority 'A' road network has been inspected to identify areas for repair in order that cost estimates can be obtained for necessary works. An example of the resulting work is the carriageways of Reigate Town Centre one-way system where patching and resurfacing was successfully carried out at night during February.

The list below gives locations of the larger surfacing works with provisional dates for Reigate and Banstead:

Road	Area	Date
A23 London Road Horley	226	11/03/10
Parsonsfield Close, Nork, Banstead	90	03/02/10
Nork Way, Nork, Banstead	118	05/02/10
Rosebushes, Epsom Downs	120	08/02/10
Merland Rise, Tadworth	424	18/02/10
Shelvers Way, Tadworth	508	23/02/10
Tadorne Road, Tadworth	143	25/02/10
Chequers Lane, Walton on the Hill	600	01/03/10
Longcroft Avenue, Banstead	264	05/03/10
Waterhouse Lane, Kingswood	197	06/03/10
Starrock Lane, Chipstead	79	08/03/10
Alderstead Lane, Merstham	664	08/03/10
Rocky Lane, Merstham	775	09/03/10
Spencer Way, White Bushes, Redhill	108	11/03/10
West Avenue, Salfords	384	12/03/10
Wheatfield Way, Horley	406	16/03/10
Wellington Way, Horley	743	18/03/10
Crutchfield Lane, Horley	1108	22/03/10
Orpin Rd, Merstham	363	25/03/10
Common Road, Redhill - LSR		22/02/10
Fenton Road, Redhill - LSR		23/02/10
Lorian Drive, Reigate - LSR		24/02/10
Woodhatch Road Roundabout - LSR		19/02/10
Reigate town centre - 6 roads		19/02/10
A2022 Winkworth Road, Banstead		26/02/10
A240 Reigate Road, Burgh Heath		?
A242 Croydon Road/Gatton Park Road		?
A2044 Woodhatch Road, Reigate		?
A217		?
A25		Mar-10